

31st March 1964]

THE HON. SRI P. KAKKAN : Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras Bhoodan Yagna (Amendment) Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1964), as amended be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill, as amended, was passed.

(4) THE MADRAS (TRANSFERRED TERRITORY) RYOTWARI SETTLEMENT BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 13 OF 1964).

(5) THE KANYAKUMARI SREEPANDARAVAKA LANDS (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 14 OF 1964).

(6) THE MADRAS (TRANSFERRED TERRITORY) THIRUPPUVARAM PAYMENT ABOLITION BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 15 OF 1964).

(7) THE MADRAS MINOR INAMS (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) AMENDMENT BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 16 OF 1964).

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, I request that all the four Bills may be taken up together since I am going to move that there be a common Select Committee for all the four Bills.

Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras (Transferred Territory) Ryotwari Settlement Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 13 of 1964) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. RAMAIAH
2. Sri A. CHIDAMBARANATHA NADAR
3. Sri R. PONNAPPA NADAR
4. Sri P. RAMACHANDRAN
5. Sri K. NARAYANASWAMY PILLAI
6. Sri A. R. SUBBIAH MUDALIAR
7. Sri R. THANGAVELU
8. Dr. B. NATARAJAN
9. Sri N. SHANMUGASUNDARAM
10. Sri G. RAJARAM
11. Sri S. MADHAVAN
12. Sri M. V. KARIVENGADAM
13. Sri A. SWAMIDHAS
14. Sri A. KUNJAN NADAR
15. Sri P. K. MOOKIAH THEVAR
16. Pulavar K. GOVINDAN
17. The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN.”

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

Sir, I move—

“ That the Kanyakumari Sreepandaravaka Lands (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1964) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. RAMAIAH
2. Sri A. CHIDAMBARANATHA NADAR
3. Sri R. PONNAPPA NADAR
4. Sri P. RAMACHANDRAN
5. Sri K. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI
6. Sri A. R. SUBBIAH MUDALIAR
7. Sri R. THANGAVELU.
8. Dr. B. NATARAJAN
9. Sri N. SHANMUGASUNDARAM
10. Sri G. RAJARAM
11. Sri S. MADHAVAN
12. Sri M. V. KARIVENGADAM
13. Sri A. SWAMIDHAS
14. Sri A. KUNJAN NADAR
15. Sri P. K. MOOKIAH THEVAR
16. Pulavar K. GOVINDAN
17. The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN.”

Sri, I move—

“ That the Madras (Transferred Territory) Thiruppuvaram Payment Abolition Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 15 of 1964) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. RAMAIAH
2. Sri A. CHIDAMBARANATHA NADAR
3. Sri R. PONNAPPA NADAR
4. Sri P. RAMACHANDRAN
5. Sri K. NARAYANASWAMY PILLAI
6. Sri A. R. SUBBIAH MUDALIAR
7. Sri R. THANGAVELU
8. Dr. B. NATARAJAN
9. Sri N. SHANMUGASUNDARAM
10. Sri G. RAJARAM
11. Sri S. MADHAVAN
12. Sri M. V. KARIVENGADAM
13. Sri A. SWAMIDHAS.

31st March 1964] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

14. Sri A. KUNJAN NADAR
15. Sri P. K. MOOKIAH THEVAR
16. Pulavar K. GOVINDAN
17. The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN."

Sir, I move—

" That the Madras Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1964; be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. RAMAIAH
2. Sri A. CHIDAMBARANATHA NADAR
3. Sri R. PONNAPPA NADAR
4. Sri P. RAMACHANDRAN
5. Sri K. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI
6. Sri A. R. SUBBIAH MUDALIAR
7. Sri R. THANGAVELU
8. Dr. B. NATARAJAN
9. Sri N. SHANMUGASUNDARAM
10. Sri G. RAJARAM
11. Sri S. MADHAVAN
12. Sri M. V. KARIVENGADAM
13. Sri A. SWAMIDHAS
14. Sri A. KUNJAN NADAR
15. Sri P. K. MOOKIAH THEVAR
16. Pulavar K. GOVINDAN
17. The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN."

This is an important piece of legislation trying to bring uniformity in the entire State of Madras in the matter of land holdings. Step by step we have been removing several kinds of intermediaries that had existed in the land. We abolished zamindars. Then after a struggle, we have also abolished all the inams. Now in the transferred territories there are certain things available to the inamdars. It was thought to have a separate enactment for the transferred territories and we now seek to introduce ryotwari settlement in Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk so that there may be complete uniformity of land tenures within the whole State of Madras.

In moving the motions for referring the four Bills to a Select Committee, I wish to explain at the outset, the land revenue system and the special tenures prevalent in the Kanyakumari district and the Shencottah taluk of Tirunelveli district.

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

In the Kanyakumari district and the Shencottah taluk of the Tirunelveli district, which were transferred to this State from the former State of Travancore-Cochin, by the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 (Central Act 37 of 1956), basic tax is payable under the T.C. Land Tax Act, 1955 (Travancore-Cochin Act XV of 1955). Under this Act, as amended by the Madras Coinage (Alteration of References) Act, 1960 (Madras Act 9 of 1960), a basic tax, at the uniform rate of two naye Paise per cent of land, which works out to Rs. 2 per acre, is charged in respect of all lands, except certain categories of land exempt from the provisions of the Act, under Section 7 of the Act, which says that the Act is not applicable to lands held or leased by the Government or any land or class of lands which the Government may, by notification in the Gazette, either wholly or partially exempt from the provisions of the Act. Under this Section, the former Travancore-Cochin Government have exempted, by notification, the Sree-pandaravaka lands belonging to Sri Padmanabhaswami Temple at Trivandrum from the provisions of the Act.

In *Moopil Nair vs. the State of Kerala* (A.I.R. 1961 S.C. 52) the Supreme Court has struck down the Travancore-Cochin Act XV of 1955, as amended by the Travancore-Cochin Land Tax (Amendment) Act, 1957 (Kerala Act X of 1957), as unconstitutional. The main ground on which it was struck down was that the levy of tax was sought to be made at a first rate, irrespective of the quality of the land and, consequently, of its productive capacity. The Court also held that section 7 of the Act was discriminatory. The following is an extract from the judgment :—

“ . . . It is common ground that the tax, assuming that the Act is really a taxing statute and not a confiscatory measure, as contended on behalf of the petitioners, has no reference to income, either actual or potential, from the property sought to be taxed. Hence it may be rightly remarked that the Act obliges every person who holds land to pay the tax at the flat rate prescribed, whether or not he makes any income out of the property, or whether or not the property is capable of yielding any income. The Act, in terms, claims to be “ a general revenue settlement of the State ” (S. 3). Ordinarily, a tax on land or land revenue is assessed on the actual or the potential productivity of the land sought to be taxed. In other words, the tax has reference to the income actually made, or which could have been made, with due diligence, and therefore, is levied with due regard to the incidence of the taxation. Under the Act in question we shall take a hypothetical case of a number of persons owning and possessing the same area of land. One makes nothing out of the land, because it is arid desert. The second one does not make any income, but could raise more crop after a disproportionately large investment of labour and capital. A third one, in due course of husbandry, is making the land yield just enough to pay for the incidental expenses and labour charges besides land tax or revenue. The fourth is making large profits, because the land is

31st March 1964] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

very fertile and capable of yielding good crops. Under the Act, it is manifest that the fourth category, in our illustration, would easily be able to bear the burden of the tax. The third one may be able to bear the tax. The first and the second one will have to pay from their own pockets, if they could afford the tax. If they cannot afford the tax, the property is liable to be sold, in due process of law, for realisation of the public demand. It is clear, therefore, that inequality is writ large on the Act and is inherent in the very provisions of the taxing section. It is also clear that there is no attempt at classification in the provisions of the Act. Hence, no more need be said as to what could have been the basis for a valid classification. It is one of those cases where the lack of classification creates inequality. It is, therefore, clearly hit by the prohibition to deny equality before the law contained in Article 14 of the Constitution. Further more, section 7 of the Act particularly the latter part, which vests the Government with the power wholly or partly to exempt any land from the provisions of the Act, is clearly discriminatory in its effect and, therefore, infringes Article 14 of the Constitution. The Act does not lay down any principle or policy for the guidance of the exercise of discretion by the Government in respect of the selection contemplated by s. 7"

The Court also held that the basic land tax on all lands without taking into consideration the relevant fertility and productivity of the land is illegal and void under the Constitution. In view of the above decision of the Supreme Court, it has become necessary, to replace the Travancore-Cochin Act XV of 1955 by a new legislation, which will not be open to the objections pointed out by the Court.

Under the ryotwari system prevailing in the rest of the State, lands are assessed at different rates, varying with fertility of the soil, quality of irrigation, outturn, marketing facilities, etc. The following extract from the pamphlet "Principles of Ryotwari Settlement" explains how the Government demand is arrived at—

"In carrying out the settlement, the Settlement Department divides the soils into certain classes with reference to their mechanical composition, subdivides them into sorts or grades with reference to their chemical and physical properties and other circumstances affecting their fertility, and attaches separate grain value to each grade after numerous examinations of the actual outturn of the staple products in each class and sort of soil. The grain value is then converted into money at the commutation price based generally on the average of the 20 non-famine years immediately preceding the settlement, for the whole district with some abatement for traders' profits and for the distance the grain has usually to be carried to the market. From the value of the gross produce thus determined, the cost of cultivation and a certain percentage on account of vicissitudes of season and unprofitable areas is deducted, and one-half of the remainder is the maximum taken as assessment or the Government demand on

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

the land. After this, soils of similar grain values, irrespective of their classification, are bracketed together in orders called tarams, each with its own rate of assessment. These rates are further adjusted with reference to the position of the village in which the lands are situated and the nature of the sources of irrigation. For this purpose, villages are formed into groups, in the case of dry lands, with reference to their proximity to roads and markets, and, in the case of wet lands, with reference to the nature and quality of the water-supply. This accounts for different rates of assessment being imposed on lands of similar soils, but situated in different groups or under different classes of irrigation."

Sir, the ryotwari assessment is in complete accord with the principles of taxation, which have been mentioned and approved by the Supreme Court. Whereas in the case of basic land tax, the Supreme Court held that it is affected by Article 14 of the Constitution. According to the sources of irrigation, the taram is fixed and therefore, the land tax is fixed in accordance with the capacity of the individual to pay. The ryotwari system cannot, therefore, be attacked under Article 14 of the Constitution of the ground that it results in discrimination. Further, as this system is prevalent in the entire State except a small area of 710 square miles comprising the Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk of the Tirunelveli district it is reasonable that the system should be extended to this area also.

The Supreme Court also held that the Travancore-Cochin Act XV of 1955 as in force in the State of Kerala did not provide for the machinery and procedure to be followed in making the assessment, that it left it to the executive to evolve the requisite machinery and procedure, that it treated the whole thing from beginning to end as a purely administrative character, completely ignoring the legal position that the assessment of tax on a person or property was atleast of a quasi-judicial character and that for these reasons, the Act contravened Article 19 (1) (f) of the Constitution.

In drafting the Madras (Transferred Territory) Ryotwari Settlement Bill, 1964, care has been taken to see that it does not suffer from the Constitutional infirmities pointed out by the Supreme Court.

The survey of the transferred territory under the Madras Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923 (Madras Act VIII of 1923) has already commenced and will be continued under the proposed Act. The settlement operations will be effected under the provisions of the proposed Act. Under clause 9 of the Bill, the ryotwari settlement will be effected in accordance with a settlement notification to be framed and published by the Government for the purpose. The notification that the Government propose to publish will embody the money rates adopted in the re-settlement notification of Tirunelveli district.

31st March 1964} [Sri R. Venkataraman]

The point here is that the rates of assessment in the Kanyakumari district would be on the same lines as that are prevailing in the neighbouring districts. There is no question of rates fixing here.

There is, therefore, no question of the rates of assessment fixed for the lands in the Transferred Territory being higher than those for similar lands in the adjoining district. This procedure has been adopted especially in view of the fact that rates fixed with reference to the prevailing high prices are bound to be far higher than the rates already fixed for similar lands in the adjoining district. Sir, if we have to effect a settlement according to the rules applicable to land revenue settlement, we will have to take into account the prevailing rates of prices of foodgrains. It means that the Kanyakumari district will have to pay a far higher rate of land revenue than the neighbouring district of Tirunelveli. As that would cause hardship, we have to decide that the same rates as are applicable to the Tirunelveli district could also be made applicable to the Kanyakumari district also. Therefore, this procedure has been adopted especially in view of the fact that rates fixed with reference to the prevailing high prices are bound to be far higher than the rates already fixed for similar lands in the adjoining district. Further, as a result of the Kanyakumari Sreepandaravaka (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1964 and the Madras (Transferred Territory) Thiruppuvaram Payment Abolition Bill, 1964, the ryots will be relieved of their liability to pay rent to Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple and Thiruppuvaram to thiruppu-holders and also of the liability to pay to the Government basic tax or Rajabhogam. Sir, I want to explain the position. At present the landowners in the Kanyakumari district are to pay a basic land tax and also rent to Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple and also Thiruppuvaram to thiruppu-holders. But under this Bill, we will abolish all these and charge only land revenue as in the Tirunelveli district and the Government will undertake the liability and the responsibility to pay both Thiruppuvaram to thiruppu-holders and rent to Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple. Hence, the total quantum of land revenue payable under the proposed settlement will be in these cases far less than the sum total of the various kinds of levies to which they are now subject thus resulting in substantial relief to the ryots. Here, I may mention that I have found out that Sreepandaravaka really means the payment to be made to God's Treasury and that is why the name of Sreepandaravaka has come about.

Coming to the Kanyakumari Sreepandaravaka Lands (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1964, this Bill relates to lands belonging to the Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple at Trivandrum. They are found only in the Kanyakumari district and not in the Shencottah taluk. Their extent in the Kanyakumari district is 4,163.67 acres under wet and 12,483.43 acres under dry. They have been exempt from basic tax by a notification issued by the former Travancore-Cochin Land Tax Act, 1955. But they are assessed to a favourable assessment called Rajabhogam. The total

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

Rajabhogam payable on the entire extent to Sreepandaravaka lands in the Kanyakumari district is Rs. 2,337.76 nP. In addition to Rajabhogam, the tenants on the lands pay rent, both in kind and in cash, to the Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple. The average annual collection of rent by the Temple during the ten years from 1946 to 1955-56 was Rs. 67,910. The systematic treatment of this tenure of land and their merger with the Ryotwari system has been awaiting solution for well over 75 years now. After the introduction of the basic tax, the tenants on Sreepandaravaka lands have been repeatedly urging that they should be relieved of their liability to pay rent to the Temple and should be given occupancy rights on the lands held by them. The Maharaja of Travancore, who is the hereditary trustee of the Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple, was willing to relinquish the Temple's rights in the lands, provided it was given every year, as tasdik allowance, an amount equal to the income which it had been deriving from the lands. After the ryotwari settlement under the Madras (Transferred Territory) Ryotwari Settlement Bill, 1964, is effected in respect of Sreepandaravaka lands in the Kanyakumari district, it is estimated that the net ryotwari assessment from the lands, after deducting Rajabhogam (or favourable assessment to the Government) now payable and collection charges, will be Rs. 64,589. It is proposed to compensate the Temple on the same basis as Inam Estates in this State, by, paying a tasdik allowance equal to the estimated net ryotwari assessment realised on the lands of this tenure.

The temple is also a major thiruppu-holder—or a beneficiary receiving a portion of assessment—and, under the Bill for the abolition of thiruppuvaram payment—further explained below—it is estimated that it will be entitled to a tasdik allowance of Rs. 85,411 per annum, in lieu of its income from thiruppuvaram. This Government, therefore, offered to pay to the Temple a sum of Rs. 1.50 lakhs, every year, as tasdik allowance, in lieu of its rental income from Sreepandaravaka lands and its income from thiruppuvaram. The Chief Minister of Madras had also a discussion on the subject with the Maharaja of Travancore. In the course of the discussion, the Maharaja has kindly agreed to the Temple being paid a sum of Rs. 1.50 lakhs, every year, as proposed by this Government. In the Sreepandaravaka Lands (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, clauses 13 and 14 and the Schedule provide for the payment of a net tasdik allowance of Rs. 45,589 to the Temple, after deducting from Rs. 64,589 being the estimated net ryotwari assessment from Sreepandaravaka lands, a sum of Rs. 18,000 being the estimated cost of annual maintenance of certain Devaswoms in the Kanyakumari district, which are now being maintained from out of the income from Sreepandaravaka lands. Sir, I want to explain that some of the temples in the Kanyakumari district are maintained out of the monies which are paid as Sreepandaravaka contribution. For this, we are providing a sum of Rs. 18,000 so that this may be transferred to Devaswoms in the Kanyakumari district and that may be spent on the temples within the Kanya-

31st March 1964] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

kumari district. The sum of Rs. 18,000 will be paid annually to the Kanyakumari Devaswom Board which will administer and maintain these Devaswoms.

The Bill provides for the grant of ryotwari patta to every tenant in respect of Sreepandaravaka lands held by him on the appointed day and where no tenant is entitled to ryotwari patta and the land vests in the Government, the ryotwari patta will be granted in accordance with the rules made by the Government.

The Bill also provides for the collection of arrears of rent outstanding on the appointed day by the Tahsildar as arrears of land revenue. The arrears of rent in excess of the rent due for any three financial years will be deemed to be discharged if the arrears for any three financial years are paid to the Tahsildar within two years of the appointed day in not more than two instalments per year. The amounts collected by the Tahsildar will be paid to the Temple after deducting collection charges, etc. This provision is on the same lines as similar provisions adopted in the Estates Abolition Act and the Inam Estates Abolition Act.

Let me now refer to the third Bill, namely, the Madras (Transferred Territory) Thiruppuvaram Payment Abolition Bill, 1964. Thiruppuvaram—literally means “diverted revenue”—is a levy on certain lands, which is in force in the Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk. Thiruppuvaram is either an assignment of revenue, or, in the case of special tenure lands, an assignment of rent, and is payable to religious, educational or charitable institutions or to individuals, on condition of rendering service to such institutions or to individuals, personally, without any condition of service. This is more or less in the nature of Inams that we have in the Madras State. It is generally payable in kind, but there are also cases of cash grants. According to Section 9 of the Travancore-Cochin Land Tax Act, 1955, thiruppuvaram is payable by the landholder *in addition* to the basic tax due to the Government. Government are anxious to make the assessment or land revenue on sound principles and do away with the dual levy of basic tax to Government and in addition thiruppuvaram to other holders. I am sure that these two Bills will at once solve a long persisting problem in the transferred territory and give the long awaited relief which the ryots have been repeatedly urging. The Madras (Transferred Territory) Thiruppuvaram Payment Abolition Bill, 1964, accordingly provides that, with effect on and from the appointed day, no thiruppu-holder shall have the right to receive payment of thiruppuvaram and no landholder shall be liable to pay thiruppuvaram to the thiruppu-holder and that the right to receive payment of, and the liability to pay, thiruppuvaram shall stand extinguished. The Bill also provides for the payment by the Government of an annual tasdik allowance in cases where the thiruppu-holder is a religious, educational or charitable institution or an individual entitled to thiruppuvaram on condition of rendering service to such an institution. The tasdik allowance will be

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

a sum equal to the aggregate of the annual amount of thiruppuvaram payable to the institution or the individual, as the case may be, and the payment will be made to the institution so long as it exists. The Bill also provides that the service thiruppu-holder will be bound to continue to render the service after the appointed day and that the institution will pay him the tasdik allowance paid to the institution by the Government, so long as he renders the service and that, if he fails to render the service, the tasdik allowance will become the absolute property of the institution on a declaration made by the prescribed authority after due enquiry and the institution will be at liberty to make such arrangements, as it thinks fit, for the performance of the service. It looks complicated but it is a simple one. In case of a thiruppu-holder, if it is done to render service to a temple or institution, he will receive it (tasdik allowance) so long as he renders service. If he fails to render service the tasdik allowance will become the absolute property of the institution and the institution will be entitled to take it or use it as their own. We have made certain provisions for enquiry to be conducted and final order to be passed to find out whether the service has been stopped or not and whether the thiruppuvaram claim should be allowed or not.

In the case of a thiruppu-holder, not being a religious, educational or charitable institution or a service thiruppu-holder, the Bill provides that the Government shall pay him, as compensation, an amount equal to 16-2/3 times the aggregate of the annual amount of thiruppuvaram payable to him. As already stated, the Sree Padmanabhaswami Temple at Trivandrum is a major thiruppu-holder and under this Bill and under the Bill for the abolition of the tenure of Sreepandaravaka lands, the temple will be entitled to an annual tasdik allowance of about Rs. 1.50 lakhs, in lieu of both its income from thiruppuvaram and its rental income from Sreepandaravaka lands.

The Bill provides for holding an enquiry into thiruppuvaram claims by the Assistant Settlement Officer to decide whether the claim should be allowed or refused, or whether the claim stands escheated or lapsed. The Assistant Settlement Officer has to verify whether the conditions subject to which the grant of thiruppuvaram was made are complied with and whether the purpose for which such grant was made subsists. Where the grantee has failed to comply with the condition or perform the service, subject to which the thiruppuvaram was granted, the thiruppuvaram shall be deemed to have lapsed and a conditional limitation operates.

The Bill also contains provision for the collection of arrears of thiruppuvaram by the Tahsildar and for payment of the amount to the thiruppu-holder after deducting collection charges, etc. The provision in this Bill is on the same lines as the provision in the Kanyakumari Sreepandaravaka Lands (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1964.

31st March 1964] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

The last Bill relates to the extension of the Madras Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963, to the transferred territory of Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk with suitable modifications. As the Members may be aware, the Minor Inams Abolition Bill, as originally introduced in the Assembly in April 1962, provided that the proposed Act would extend to the whole of the State of Madras. But the Joint Select Committee on the Bill considered that it would be best to undertake separate legislation for the special tenures prevalent in the transferred territory and therefore recommended that the Minor Inams Abolition Act need not be made applicable to that territory. In view of the Bills now brought forward by the Government for the abolition of special tenures in the transferred territory, it has been decided that the Minor Inams Abolition Act may also be extended to that territory, and hence this amending Bill has been brought forward.

In conclusion, I may state that there are but few more matters relating to the transferred territory requiring legislation. There are jenmom lands. The kudiya's owning these lands have to pay jenmikaram to the jenmi in addition to the basic tax to Government. The question of abolishing this jenmikaram payment is under consideration. There are also Sripadom lands, which belong to the ladies of the Travancore palace. The tenants on the lands have to pay rent to the Sripadom owners, in addition to the Rajabhogam payable to the Government. The question of relieving the tenants of their liability to pay rent is under consideration. There is also a proposal to repeal the Travancore Oodukkoor Settlement Proclamation, 1122, which is in force in the transferred territory. The Oodukkoor settlement operations, taken up in pursuance of the Proclamation have the following three objects:—

(i) the splitting up of multiple-tenure holdings into their components;

(ii) the subdivision of holdings registered jointly into individual pattas and mutation of registry by localising and splitting up the share of each, and where it cannot be split up, by paying compensation for the rest;

(iii) as far as possible, to bring into the landholdings the trees and to converge the ownerships of both into the holding of a single pattadar. Again where the enjoyment of trees was joint, individual enjoyment has also to be effected.

This is a kind of society in which a large number of holdings are held in common. Some people have a right to lands only. Some people had a right only to a particular share, about 3/420 or 4/250 of these lands. The lands were held in common, everybody having a right to enjoyment of a particular share. Our object is to split up multiple-tenure holdings into their components and to make every owner to own a particular specified part of land or trees.

To the extent holdings are divided by metes and bounds based on mutual consent and subdivision is effected in the present survey on that basis, this problem would be solved considerably even in the

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [31st March 1964]

course of the proposed ryotwari settlement, though disputed ownership will still be an issue that has to be settled by the civil courts. The question of repealing the proclamation and replacing it by a simple enactment is also under consideration of Government.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I request the House to accept the motions for referring these Bills to a Select Committee. I wish to add that in view of the fact that these Bills relate to a particular type of tenure in Kanyakumari district, the Select Committee could also take evidence in Kanyakumari district in respect of these lands.

SRI R. PONNAPPA NADAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to add a few words in regard to the four bills which are now to be referred to a Select Committee. So far as revenue assessment is concerned in the Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk an average rate of 2 nP. per cent was levied according to the Travancore Land Tax Act. That Act has been struck down as invalid by the Supreme Court (A.I.R. 1961, Supreme Court, 552). This question was mooted in *Moopil Nair v. the State of Kerala* in which the assessment made under the Travancore Land Tax Act was sought to be questioned. That Act, under which a flat rent was levied had been declared illegal and struck down by the Supreme Court. Consequent on the decision arrived at by the Supreme Court, this legislation has now been brought in. The main purpose of this legislation is now to bring in these lands under ryotwari settlement. That has been explained by the Hon. Minister. So far as rent that is obtaining in lands in Kanyakumari district is concerned, for a long number of years, the rent system there has been peculiar. There is so much of peculiarity in it. I would like to emphasise one or two points for the consideration of the Select Committee. So far as the land tenure that is pertaining in the Kanyakumari district is concerned, it is a peculiar case. It is a part of the princely Travancore-Cochin State for many years. So far as the land system is concerned I would like to bring one or two points to the notice of the Hon. Minister for his consideration.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member can state them before the Select Committee.

SRI R. PONNAPPA NADAR : I am stating only about the general principle and not about the clauses of the Bill, Sir. It has been stated that the Act would apply from 1st April 1963 and the kist would be levied from April 1963. The Act itself was notified only in March 1964. Giving retrospective effect may not be proper, so far as the payment of kist is concerned, as per the decision of the Supreme Court. I would emphasise that retrospective effect need not be given so far as the collection of tax is concerned.

With regard to the abolition of jenmikaram, the Hon. Minister has stated that it is under the consideration of the Government and will be initiated shortly. I would humbly plead that they may be taken up before this Bill becomes the law. This is a point which

31st March 1964] [Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar]

I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister. The kudiyaans owning these lands have to pay jenmikaram to the jenmi. It has been in vogue from 1071 and subsequent legislation was made in 1108. There is Jenmikaram Settlement proclamation. Now the jenmikaram is being collected by the Revenue Department. I would plead that so far this levy is concerned; it should also be abolished. Another point, which I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister is at present there is no Land Assessment Act. It was being suspended by the former Travancore-Cochin State. Now there are Kudukirishi lands. There is no provision for assessment of these lands. Special legislation has to be initiated in this regard also. I think before the settlement Rules are framed, these particulars may be ascertained with regard to Kanyakumari district. These are observations, which I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister. I request that Sri A. R. Subbiah Mudaliar representing Shencottah taluk may also be included in the Select Committee, so that . . .

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, he is a Member of the Select Committee.

SRI R. PONNAPPA NADAR : With these observations. I welcome the general principles embodied in the four Bills and request that other legislations should be brought in as early as possible so that the tenants may be given necessary protection.

With these words, I welcome the Bills.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member is a Member in the Select Committee. Therefore, he can make emphatic representations there.

The question is—

“ That the Madras (Transferred Territory) Ryotwari Settlement Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 13 of 1964), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah.
2. Sri A. Chidambaranatha Nadar.
3. Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar.
4. Sri P. Ramachandran.
5. Sri K. Narayanaswami Pillai.
6. Sri A. R. Subbiah Mudaliar.
7. Sri R. Thangavelu.
8. Dr. B. Natarajan.
9. Sri N. Shanmugasundaram.
10. Sri G. Rajaram.
11. Sri S. Madhavan.
12. Sri M. V. Karivengadam.
13. Sri A. Swamidhas.

[Mr. Speaker]

[31st March 1964]

14. Sri A. Kunjan Nadar.
15. Sri P. K. Mookiah Thevar.
16. Pulavar K. Govindan.
17. The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Under Rule 99 (1) of the Assembly Rules, I nominate the Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman, to be the Chairman of the Committee.

The question is—

“That the Kanyakumari Sreepandaravaka Lands (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1964), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah.
2. Sri A. Chidambaranatha Nadar.
3. Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar.
4. Sri P. Ramachandran.
5. Sri K. Narayanaswami Pillai.
6. Sri A. R. Subbiah Mudaliar.
7. Sri R. Thangavelu.
8. Dr. B. Natarajan.
9. Sri N. Shanmugasundaram.
10. Sri G. Rajaram.
11. Sri S. Madhavan.
12. Sri M. V. Karivengadam.
13. Sri A. Swamidhas.
14. Sri A. Kunjan Nadar.
15. Sri P. K. Mookiah Thevar.
16. Pulavar K. Govindan.
17. The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Under rule 99 (1) of the Assembly Rules, I nominate the Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman to be the Chairman of the Committee.

The question is—

‘That the Madras (Transferred Territory) Thiruppuvaram Payment Abolition Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 15 of 1964), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Legislative Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah.
2. Sri A. Chidambaranatha Nadar.
3. Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar.

31st March 1964]

[Mr. Speaker]

4. Sri P. Ramachandran.
5. Sri K. Narayanaswami Pillai.
6. Sri A. R. Subbiah Mudaliar.
7. Sri R. Thangavelu.
8. Dr. B. Natarajan.
9. Sri N. Shanmugasundaram.
10. Sri G. Rajaram.
11. Sri S. Madhavan.
12. Sri M. V. Karivengadam.
13. Sri A. Swamidhas.
14. Sri A. Kunjan Nadar.
15. Sri P. K. Mookiah Thevar.
16. Pulavar K. Govindan.
17. The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Under rule 99 (1) of the Assembly Rules, I nominate the Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman to be the Chairman of the Committee.

The question is—

“ That the Madras Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1964) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members of the Assembly :—

1. The Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah.
2. Sri A. Chidambaranatha Nadar.
3. Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar.
4. Sri P. Ramachandran.
5. Sri K. Narayanaswami Pillai.
6. Sri A. R. Subbiah Mudaliar.
7. Sri R. Thangavelu.
8. Dr. B. Natarajan.
9. Sri N. Shanmugasundaram.
10. Sri G. Rajaram.
11. Sri S. Madhavan.
12. Sri M. V. Karivengadam.
13. Sri A. Swamidhas.
14. Sri A. Kunjan Nadar.
15. Sri P. K. Mookiah Thevar.
16. Pulavar K. Govindan.
17. The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.

[Mr. Speaker]

[31st March 1964]

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Under Rule 99 (1) of the Assembly Rules, I nominate the Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman, to be the Chairman of the Committee.

(8) THE MADRAS BUILDINGS (LEASE AND RENT CONTROL)
AMENDMENT BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 17 OF 1964).

திரு. நா. ப. செங்கோட்டுவேலு : தலைவர் அவர்களே, அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கொண்டு வர இருக்கும் மசோதா 28-ம் தேதிதான் இந்த சபையில் அறிமுகம் செய்யப்பட்டது. மசோதா காப்பி கூட நேற்று இரவு 11 மணிக்குத்தான் மெம்பர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. ஐந்து நாட்கள் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்ற சட்டசபை விதி இருந்தும் இப்படி அவசரமாகக் கொண்டு வருவது முறையா என அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

கனம் திரு. ஆர். வெங்கட்டராமன் : சரியான அவகாசம் கொடுத்து பில்கள் கொண்டு வரவேண்டும் என்பதுதான் சர்க்காரின் நோக்கம். அந்தவிதமான ஆட்சேபனை சொன்னது தவறு என்று நாங்கள் சொல்லவில்லை. இது கொஞ்சம் அவசரமான முக்கியமான மசோதாவாக இருப்பதால் கனம் அங்கத்தினர் அவர்களுடைய ஆட்சேபணையை வாய்ஸ் பெற்று இந்த மசோதாவை ஆலோசனைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொள்ளும்படியாகக் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister seeks the co-operation of the hon. Member.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM: Sir, I move—

“That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

‘That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.’

SRI N. P. SENGOTTUVELU: Sir, I move—

“In item (ii) of section 30 of the principal Act, for the words ‘two hundred and fifty rupees’ the words ‘four hundred rupees’ be substituted, and make necessary consequential changes.”

மன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்துள்ள மசோதாவில் நான்-ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் பில்டிங்களுக்கு 400 ரூபாய்க்கு மேற்பட்டு வாடகை உள்ளவைகளில் எல்லாம்

31st March 1964]

[திரு. நா. ப. செங்கோட்டுவேலு]

எப்போது வேண்டுமானாலும் கட்டட சொந்தக்காரர்கள் காலி செய்யலாம் என்பதற்கு விலக்கு அளிக்கிற இந்த மசோதாவில் ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் பில்டிங்களுக்கு மட்டும் 250 ரூபாய்க்கு மேலே கொடுப்பவர்களை எப்போது வேண்டுமானாலும் அவர்களை எளிக்ட் செய்ய இதில் விதி இருக்கிறது. எனவே அவற்றையுமீ சேர்த்துக் கொண்டுவந்திருந்தால் மிகவும் நன்றாக யிருந்திருக்கும். நான்-ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் பில்டிங்குக்கு 300 ரூபாய் வாடகைக்குக் கொடுக்கலாம் என்றால் கட்டட சொந்தக் காரர்கள் அவர்களை வெளியேற்ற வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத் தோடு 400-ஆக உயர்த்தி அவர்களை எப்போது வேண்டுமானாலும் வெளியேற்ற வாய்ப்பாகயிருக்கும் என்று கருதி இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறோம் என்று அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் தெரிவிக்கிறார்கள். ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் பில்டிங்காக இருந்தால் 200 ரூபாய்தான் வாடகை கொடுக்க முடியும் என்று இருந்தாலும் வெளியேற்ற வாய்ப்பிருக்கும் என்று கருதி 250 ரூபாய் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று வாங்கிக்கொண்டு நினைத்த நேரத்தில் அவர்களை வெளியேற்ற இது வாய்ப்பாக இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே வாடகை 400 ரூபாய்க்குக் கீழே கொடுப்பவர்களையும் வெளியேற்ற முடியாது என்று சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தினால் ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் பில்டிங்கில் குடியிருப்பவர்களுக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டம் துணையாக இருக்கும் என்று கருதித்தான் இத் திருத்தத்தைக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். ஆகவே அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இதை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளுமாறு கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER: The clause and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

திரு. வை. சங்கரன்: கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் செங்கோட்டுவேலு அவர்கள் கொடுத்திருக்கின்ற திருத்தம் 'அவுட் ஆஃப் ஆர்டர்' என்று நினைக்கிறேன். பிரின்ஸிபல் ஆக்டிங்கே அமென்மென்ட் கொண்டுவருவது சரியாகாது, இதை எப்படி டிப்பார்ட்மென்ட்காரர்கள் அனுமதித்தார்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை, "வர்டிங்" ஏதாவது மாற்ற வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லியிருந்தால் இந்தத் திருத்தம் சரியாக இருந்திருக்கும். அங்கத்தினர் அவர்கள் கொடுத்திருக்கும் திருத்தம் பிரின்ஸிபல் ஆக்டிங்கே கொடுத்திருக்கும் திருத்தமாக இருக்கிறது. இதை எப்படி டிப்பார்ட்மென்டில் அனுமதித்தார்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை. இப்படி Over look பண்ணிப் போகக் கூடாது. இனிமேலாவது ஜாக்கிரதையாகப் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். ஆகவேதான் இந்தத் திருத்தம் ஆர்டரில் இல்லை என்பதைத் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

இரண்டாவதாக, ரென்ட் கண்ட்ரோல் ஆக்ட் நடைமுறைக்கு வந்த பின்னால், அதிலுள்ள கஷ்டங்கள் பற்றி பல முறையீடுகள் வந்திருக்கும். அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டுதான் திருத்தங்கள் செய்ய அரசாங்கம் முடிவு எடுத்திருக்கிறது. குறிப்பாக நான்-ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் ஏரியாவாக இருந்தால் 400 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல்

[திரு. வை. சங்கரன்]

[31st March 1964]

இருந்தால் அதை எவிக்ஷன் பண்ணுவதற்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்கிறார்கள். இப்படி வரும்போது 20, 30 வருஷமாக ஒரேயிடத்தில் இருந்தவர்களுக்கு காலி செய்யச் சொல்லும்போது, பொருளாதாரத்தில் மிகவும் பாதகம் ஏற்படுகிறது. இதைப்பற்றி பல முறையிலுள்ள சர்க்காருக்கு வந்திருக்கிறது. இதன் காரணமாக 400 ரூபாய்க்கு மேலே இருந்தால் இந்த ஆக்ட் அப்பீன் ஆகாது என்றிருந்த சப்-கிளாஸையே எடுத்துவிடுகின்ற முறையில்தான் இப்போது அரசாங்கம் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறது. சர்க்காருடைய உள்நோக்கத்தை வரவேற்க வேண்டியது தான். அதே சமயத்தில் நிவாரணம் கொடுத்திருக்கின்ற முறை சரியல்ல என்றுதான் என் மனதில் படுகிறது. காரணம் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை முதலில் 1960-ல் கொண்டு வந்தபோது என்னென்ன முறையில் ரிலாக்ஸ் செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதைப்பற்றிச் சொல்லப் பட்டிருந்தது. அதில் மூன்று விதமான கன்ட்ரோல்களைப்பற்றிச் சொல்லப்பட்டிருந்தது. அதாவது அக்காமடேஷன் கன்ட்ரோல், லெட்டிங் கன்ட்ரோல், ரென்ட் கன்ட்ரோல் இவ்விதமாக மூன்று இனங்களைப்பற்றியும் பரிசீலனை செய்து முடிவு செய்திருக்கிறோம். அக்காமடேஷன் கன்ட்ரோல் முறையில் ஏற்கெனவே ஓரிடத்திலிருந்து இன்னொரு இடத்திற்கு மாறவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னால் அதற்கு நாம் அனுமதிப்பதில்லை, புதிதாக வேண்டியவர்களுக்குத் தான் கொடுத்து வருகிறோம். ஓரளவு கன்ட்ரோலைத் தளர்த்த வேண்டும் என்ற முறையில்தான், ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் ஏரியாவுக்கு 250-க்கு மேலும், நான்-ரெஸிடென்ஷியல் ஏரியாவுக்கு 400-க்கு மேலும் சட்டத்திலிருந்து விதிவிலக்கு கொடுத்திருந்தோம். இதை நடைமுறையில் கொண்டு வரும்போது பல கஷ்டங்கள் ஏற்பட்டன என்பதை நாம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டியதுதான். ஆனால் அதற்காக, “ஸ்விங்கிங் தி பென்டிலம்” என்கின்ற முறையில், முதலாவது ஒன்றை நிர்ணயித்துவிட்டு, பின்னால் மறுபுறத்திற்குப் போவதும், பின்னால் திரும்பவும் இந்த இடத்திற்கு வருவதுமாக இருக்கக்கூடாது. பொதுவாக சென்னையைப் பொறுத்தவரையில், 400 ரூபாய் என்று நிர்ணயித்ததை வேண்டுமானால் இதை இன்னும் ஓரளவுக்குத் தளர்த்தக்கூடிய முறையில் 800 ரூபாய் என்றே அல்லது 1,000 ரூபாய் என்றே வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாம், அதே போன்று மொஃபிலஸ் ஏரியாவுக்கு அதாவது மதுரை போன்ற டௌன்களுக்கு 600 ரூபாய் அல்லது 800 ரூபாய் என்றே வைத்துக் கொள்ளலாம். அதல்லாமல் ஒரேயடியாக ஒரு பக்கத்திலிருந்து இன்னொரு பக்கத்திற்கு பென்டிலம் போய்க்கொண்டிருப்பது போல் போய் மறுபடியும் திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டுவந்து கொண்டிருந்தால் நம்முடைய கொள்கையைச் சரியானபடி நிறைவேற்றியதாக ஆகாது. ஓரளவுக்கு லிமிட் இருந்தால்தான் நன்றாக இருக்கும். ஓரளவுக்கு கன்ட்ரோல் தளர்த்தவேண்டும் என்ற முறை இருந்தால்தான் நமது பாலிஸிக்குச் சரியாக அமையும், அப்படியில்லாமல், ஒரே அடியாக இந்த கிளாஸையே எடுத்து விடுவதால் இதற்கு முரண்பாடாகத்தான் இருக்கும் என்பதைச் சொல்லிக் கொண்டு முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

31st March 1964]

கனம் திரு. ஆர். வெங்கட்டராமன் : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் அங்கத்தினர் செங்கோட்டுவேலு அவர்கள் கொடுத்திருக்கும் திருத்தம் முற்றிலும் அவுட் ஆர்டர் ஆர்டர் என்று சொல்விட முடியாது . . .

It can be argued that because the word 'or' occurring in that clause is also sought to be amended, that clause is before the House for amendment. But I do not propose to stand on technicalities and I want to explain the main purpose of this amending Bill.

இப்போது நாம் நிறைவேற்றியிருக்கின்ற சட்டத்தில் பிஸினஸ் பிரிமிஸஸ் என்றிருந்தால், 400 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் இருந்தால் எக்ஸம்ஷன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. அதன் விளைவு என்னவாயிற்று என்றால், சென்னை நகரத்தில் நீண்ட நாட்களாக இருக்கின்ற பல ஸ்தாபனத்தினர்களை இப்போது கொடுப்பதைவிட அதிகமாக கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லி வற்புறுத்தினார்கள், அப்படியில்லை என்றால் உடனடியாக காலி செய்ய வேண்டும், இல்லாவிட்டால் ரூ. 5,000 கொடுங்கள், 6,000 கொடுங்கள் என்று வற்புறுத்துகின்ற நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டது. இப்படி வரும்போது சட்டத்தினுடைய ஸ்பிரிட் போய்விடுகிறது. எந்தச் சட்டமாக இருந்தாலும் அதனுடைய உட்கருத்துக்கள் நல்ல முறையில் நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமானால் மக்கள் நல்ல முறையில் ஒத்துழைக்க வேண்டும். அவ்விதமில்லாமல் சட்டத்தை உபயோகித்து எக்ஸ்பிளாய்ட் பண்ண ஆரம்பித்துவிட்டால், மறுபடியும் சட்டத்தை நெருக்கமாகக் கொண்டு வரவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்படுகிறது. இப்போதைய சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக பல கேஸ்கள் இன்றைக்கு வந்திருக்கின்றன. இதற்கெல்லாம் நிவாரணம் அளிக்கவேண்டும் என்ற முறையில்தான், இந்தச் சட்டத்தை இப்போது கொண்டு வரவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டது. அதே போன்று ரெஸிடன்ஸ் பில்டிங்-களைப் பொறுத்தவரையில், இப்போது இருப்பதை இன்னும் அதிகமாக லிமிட்டை உயர்த்தவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டார்கள். அது மட்டுமல்ல, பல பகுதிகளை எடுத்துக்கொண்டாலும், தனித் தனியாக இருந்து வாடகைக்குக் கொடுத்திருந்தாலும், அதன் மூலமாக 250 ரூபாய் அளவுக்குக் குறைந்திருந்தால் ரென்ட் கன்ட்ரோலுக்கு வரும் என்று செய்திருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் இம்மாதிரிப்பட்ட இடங்களிலிருந்து இதுவரை புகார் ஒன்றும் வரவில்லை. இவ்விதமாக நியாயமற்ற முறையில் ரெஸிடன்ஸ் ஏரியாக்களில் இருப்பவர்கள் வாடகை கேட்கிறார்கள் என்று ஏதாவது புகார்கள் வருமானால், அல்லது இவ்விதம் வாடகைக் கேட்டு, வெளியேறச் சொல்லுகிறார்கள், அல்லது தொந்தரவு கொடுக்கிறார்கள் என்று புகார்கள் வருமானால், நான்-ரெஸிடன்ஷியல் ஏரியாக்களுக்கு எப்படி அரசாங்கம் இது போன்ற திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்ததோ, அதே மாதிரி ரெஸிடன்ஸ் ஏரியாவுக்கும் பொருந்தக்கூடிய விதத்தில் திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வர அரசாங்கம் தயங்காது என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

[திரு. ஆர். வெங்கட்டராமன்] [31st March 1964]

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 1, the Preamble and the Long Title were put and carried.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Sir, I move—

11-30 a.m. That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.R. Bill No. 17 of 1964), be passed."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now adjourn *sine die*.

The House then adjourned *sine die*.

IX. — PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

A. Statutory Rules and Orders.

* 148. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 153, Public Works (Electricity), dated 20th January 1964 making the rules known as "the Madras Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Rules, 1964". [Laid on the Table of the House under section 17 (2) of the Madras Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Act, 1962 (Madras Act 4 of 1962).]

149. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 199, Home, dated 23rd January 1964 amending the Madras Denatured Spirit Methyl Alcohol and Varnish (French Polish) Rules, 1959, as subsequently amended. [Laid on the Table of the House under section 54 (3) of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937 (Madras Act X of 1937).]

150. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 269, Rural Development and Local Administration, dated 7th February 1964, regarding dissolution for a period of one year with effect on and from 1st March 1964, the Zamin Nathampatti Panchayat in Ramanathapuram district. [Laid on the Table of the House under section 179 (4) of the Madras Panchayats Act, 1958 (Madras Act XXXV of 1958).]

151. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 238, Home, dated 28th January 1964 amending the Madras Cinemas (Regulation) Rules, 1957, as subsequently amended. [Laid on the Table of the House under section 10 (3) of the Madras Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1955 (Madras Act IX of 1955).]

152. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 363, Rural Development and Local Administration, dated 14th February 1964 regarding constitution of Sankarankoil Municipality from 1st April 1964 comprising the local area within the jurisdiction of the Sankarankoil Town Panchayat in Tirunelveli district. [Laid on the Table of the House under section 304 (d) of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920 (Madras Act V of 1920).]